

New York Tribune.

First to Last the Truth: News, Editorials, Advertisements.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 1, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Office: 100 N. York St., New York City.

Subscription Rates: By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

FOREIGN RATES: DAILY AND SUNDAY. One year, \$12.00; Six months, \$7.00; Three months, \$4.00. DAILY ONLY. One year, \$8.00; Six months, \$5.00; Three months, \$3.00.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute certainty. If dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

Mr. Worcester's Testimony: What Does Our Gentle Critic, "The Evening Post," Think of It?

We fear for the self-possession of "The Evening Post" when it takes up the testimony given yesterday before the Senate Philippines Committee by Mr. Dean C. Worcester. In its usual gracious and temperate way "The Post" accused us the other day of being "meaner than the meanest Filipino" because we said that the codding of Filipino politicians through the Jones bill and the mistaken Don't shoot us-we're-going-to-get-out-on-the-next-line policy of the administration were bound to encourage native insubordination and sedition.

According to "The Post's" sensitive philosophy it was "like a Moro jurado running amuck" to dwell on the moral of the Ricarte revolt at the very time when a Senate committee was about to report the Jones bill to augment the power of the Filipino politicians. That showed a "wretched spirit," bound to be resented by every militant anti-imperialist and by every native agitator fearful of losing new opportunities to exploit his fellow countrymen.

The absolutely crushing thing to us, according to "The Post's" view, was its use of an interview with Mr. Worcester to confound our arguments. Mr. Worcester said in that interview that Ricarte was not a very serious revolutionary and that stories about uprisings in the Philippines ought to be scrutinized with special care while the Jones bill was pending. The Tribune did scrutinize the story which came to it from a responsible source in Manila. We knew that we were not circulating a canard; and Mr. Worcester himself has now fully substantiated our cable dispatch through the dispatch which he himself submitted yesterday to the Senate committee. The latter message came from Mr. P. G. McDonnell, a Manila editor, and Mr. Worcester vouches for its accuracy.

As to the conclusions which we drew from the facts reported, thereby incurring the charge of being "meaner than the meanest Filipino," we notice that Mr. McDonnell agrees entirely with us. He says: "It is generally believed the disturbance is being influenced by widespread idea of government weakness. Sedition not suppressed because of wrong interpretation of promises of administration in circulation by politicians among ignorant masses. . . . Uprising insignificant in accomplishment, but dangerous on account of potential agitation of lowest classes."

That is exactly what The Tribune said about the inevitable effects of a policy which played into the hands of the Filipino politicians and enabled them to create the belief that the United States government had become weary of its sovereignty, irresolute and timorous. It is only human nature—especially so in a partially civilized community like the Philippines—to misconstrue as weakness the apologetic, easygoing attitude of a stronger race. However well intentioned the Wilson-Harrison-Jones-Quezon policy may be, it misses the real point of the situation in the Philippines, where whatever the United States may hope to accomplish will be best accomplished through the firmest possible insistence on its own prestige and authority.

Mr. Worcester's testimony before the Philippines Committee equally sustained The Tribune's arguments. Here is a brief summary of his beliefs, based on his long stay in the islands:

Mr. Worcester gave it as his opinion that the disturbances were what might be expected if independence were granted. He said Philippine politicians, "who love to fish in troubled waters," were in favor of immediate independence, meaning an independence for them to hold office with the United States Navy, by the way, in the harbors to prevent international complications. He asserted that the "vocal" sentiment of the islands was in favor of independence, but the predominant real sentiment was opposed to it. He said that fear of vengeance prevented many from uttering their true views.

That is the situation as we have many times described it. The Jones bill, granting much more license to the politicians than they now enjoy, can only increase agitation and unrest. It is therefore pernicious. It is plainly inimical to the welfare of the people of the Philippines, to say nothing of its disastrous effect in weakening and smirching the authority of the United States.

Victory at Last for Teacher-Mothers.

The recommendation of the Board of Education's special committee that a leave of absence of two years be granted for child-bearing represents a substantial victory at last for the teacher-mothers. There seems to be some disposition to quibble about the fact that a leave of absence of two years is to be mandatory. That may be a hardship in individual cases, and in other cases where it does not bear heavily on the teacher it may operate to deprive the schools of valuable service for an unnecessarily long time. Yet it is not a bad rule, on the whole. Most teachers would be glad to be assured of two years off in which to bear offspring and care for the child through the critical first year of life.

There should be little opposition to this when the Board of Education takes it up for passage. The teacher-mothers and their supporters have carried their point and should not be unduly militant in regard to the terms of the peace treaty. If the proposed rule proves, after experience, to be wrong, it can easily be amended as to the time of leave. On the other hand, those members of the board who have stood out for

Instant dismissal of a teacher about to become a mother must have become convinced that their position is untenable and that they ought to accept this report of a special committee as evidence that a changed policy will help individual teachers and not harm the schools. A change of policy is thoroughly desirable. It is a pity that it was not made a couple of years ago.

A Body Blow for Fake Medicines.

The Board of Health backed up The Tribune's fight against fake medicines splendidly yesterday by adopting a new section in the Sanitary Code directed specifically against them. This provides that all proprietary or patent medicines must register their ingredients with the Health Department. "Proprietary or patent medicines" are defined as those whose names or definitions are not registered in the United States Pharmacopoeia or National Formulary, or those which do not bear the name of each ingredient, in English, on the box, bottle or package containing them.

This, of course, will end the secrecy on which fake medicines have thrived. It will permit the Health Department inspectors to drive out of business—in this city, at least—the "cures" whose active principles are alcohol or habit forming drugs. It will soon operate to relieve the credulous of the harpies who have been fattening on them. The Health Department under Dr. Goldwater may be trusted to show no mercy to these swindlers. It was a bright day for this city when the provision against their fake medicines was written into the Sanitary Code.

Not a "Comfortable Administration" for the Bosses.

Senator Elton R. Brown, who will be the Republican leader of the upper branch of the state Legislature, predicts a restoration of "the comfortable administration of state affairs which existed before Governor Dix was inducted into office." He declares also that all the evils of the four years of Democracy will speedily be undone.

That will be fine, if the "comfortable administration" does not become unduly comfortable and unduly Republican, and if in undoing the Democratic evils there is no falling into new ones. The period before Governor Dix was the period of Hughes—which some Republican leaders then didn't consider especially comfortable. It was a good time for the people, and a bad time for political bosses of any party. If that's the kind of administration the new Republican rule is to be it will have the hearty co-operation of the public. It should not be forgotten that the public did not turn Murphy and his gang out of Albany in order to admit the Republican Old Guard with Odell-Platt tendencies and tactics.

The Government as Ship Owner.

The need of American ships is urgent, and it is extremely unfortunate to find the administration's measure of relief taking the form which it does. Mr. Wilson in his message used language which every one could approve. He appeared to advocate government owned lines solely as an emergency measure, to develop routes like those to South America which have never been adequately supplied with vessels for American use. The parallel cited of our first transcontinental railroad made this position clear.

But neither the bill approved by the majority of the Senate Committee on Commerce nor the words used by Senator Fletcher in reporting the measure conform to this purpose. The bill is broad enough to permit the government to go into the shipping business on any routes, regardless of special needs. Under it the commission in charge could organize routes to Europe or to any other adequately supplied part of the world. The one great and urgent demand is for carriers to South America, and the bill ought to be restricted to this specific purpose.

Equally to be regretted with the loose character of the legislation is the inaccurate language of Senator Fletcher in drawing a supposed comparison with the governmental control of railroads. Government shipping he asserts to be the only method by which we can exercise over seagoing routes the control which we have adopted with regard to carriers on land. It is extremely hard to see why, if we had privately owned ships, we could not regulate them exactly as we regulate our railroads. The real trouble is, of course, not that we cannot control our ships, but that we have not got the ships to control. The Fletcher bill is a short and dangerous cut toward a result which could be far better reached by the stimulation of normal business enterprise. Its method should be used where absolutely necessary and nowhere else.

The Year Just Begun.

Every unkind thing has been said about the year of grace 1914 that can be said. It deserved no less. If ever a year will pass into history as a black one, a storm cloud along the centuries, 1914 must bear that fate. It witnessed the mightiest eruption of hate, the largest outburst of evil passions, the world has ever known.

It is 1915 to be the year of Peace—the date to be remembered by schoolboys for centuries to come as that of the signing of the greatest covenant of progress thus far written by man? Is it to be as white and shining as 1914 was black and hopeless? The prophets have not spoken, and they would have scant hearing if they did speak. Faith in everything human is at a discount at present, and few will care to rely on a future by whatever expert painted. The bulk of military opinion probably sees little chance for 1915 to improve on its predecessor. It seems all too likely to witness day after day of continued slaughter, infinitesimal gains and increasing suffering.

The lot of this country is peculiarly fortunate, in one way; less blessed in another. We are spared the horrors of war, its devastations, its crimes; but we lack also its inspiration, its usefulness and grandeur. If we manage to live along at half speed in comparative comfort, let us not forget that we are missing altogether the spur of great national endeavor and sacrifice. We escape the waste of battle, but we are alive to our duty toward the destruction found in peace? We have drifted into a winter of starvation and hardship, for example, with little or nothing done toward meeting its needs. We have felt the call of a war-stricken country an ocean away more keenly than the needs of our neighbors. That is scarcely a matter for blame. It is the way of human nature. But must it always be the way of this nation of human beings? Cannot we take the coming year with its gift of days from the gods that are and apply some of the inspiration of a great war to the works of peace? Instead of drifting along contentedly in the relative quiet of our aloofness, cannot we feel some of the quickened emotion that fights in the trenches of Europe and devote it to our own national life?

The Conning Tower

BALLADE.

Wastrel and miser,
Shackled and free,
This gushing Geyser
Of Poetree
Wishes with glee
You'll get your due
Of things to be—
The same to you!

To Bill the Kaiser
Across the sea;
To mortals wiser
Than even he;
To them that flee
From culture's crew;
To Germany—
The same to you!

To good adviser:
To J. McCree;
To advertiser
We guarantee:
To eau-de-vie.
Tra-la-la-loo!
Tra-la-la-lee!
The same to you.

You wish, perdie,
A Happy New
Year unto me?
The same to you.

And as many of them as are good for you.

The same to Henry Grantland Rice, the w. k. orator and statistician, who tremblingly debuts into our sport page this chill January morning.

And homelous wishes to our friends who sent us blotters yesterday. If we use one a day, we shan't need any until September 11, 1924.

One resolution we are making; and only one. During 1915 we shall call The Boss's attention, from time to time, to how grand it would be to send us to San Francisco for a month or so; and what grand pieces we could write about the Exposition.

RING OUT, WILD BELLS!

Ring out, wild bells, to the wild sky,
The crowds that revel, drink and fight;
The restaurants that run all night;
Ring out, wild bells, and let them die.

Ring out the old, ring in the new;
Ring out the Dulcinean jest,
And Vivienne, and all the rest;
Ring out—but let me name a few:

Ring out the grief that saps the mind,
For wheezes we have seen before;
The verbal horrors of the war;
The typographs, the cuts unkind.

Ring out the wheezes on the Ford;
And cut the verse of Miss O'Byrne;
Ring in some novel jest, we yearn;
Ring in a tonic for the bored.

Ring out the pun, the free verse sin,
I quote the bard of former times:
"Ring out, ring out my mournful rhymes,
But ring the fuller minstrel in."

IRWIN.

Thank you, Irwin, we shall try to take your advice and to make the column zipper. But when your stuff doesn't come in, we have to plug the gap with our own old and feeble pleasantries.

Our thanks to the 1914 contris, who made the world's pleasantest and most interesting job also the universe's easiest.

A NEW YEAR'S CARD TO PHYLLIS.

This New Year's, Phyllis, 'twould seem fit
To smite the lyre's strings in your praise.
Alas! I have no skill nor wit
To hymn you on this day of days.

The lyric that I fain would sing,
A lyric, fresh and true and strong,
Is but a poor and lifeless thing—
The broken echo of a song.

And yet, when you shall hear my air,
'Twill seem all lovely and delightful,
To you 'twill seem all new and rare,
For oh! your taste in verse is frightful!

ISOSCELES.

Zero in advertising has been reached by the man who writes copy for a cigar and cigarette holder. "For a candle holder," he says, "it will come in very handy in many cases at funerals."

Eavesdropper—PURCHASER: "Have you Walter Lippmann's 'Drift and Mastery'?" BOOK-CLERK: "Oh, yes. A book on Yachting."

THE NEW YEAR.

Written especially for this Dome of Dulness.

Sing a song of greeting
Unto the glad New Year,
Happy days await us
Aglow with love and cheer;
Though some days be bitter,
Indeed, there'll be a few,
Greater far the number
Of joyous days most true.

Welcome happy New Year,
Abloom with promise fair,
Bring us hope and patience,
Courage to do and dare;
Thus we greet you kindly,
Unbounded is the grace
That we wish to show you
Escorting you to place.

MARY C. BURKE.

William M. Leath, managing editor of The Cincinnati Commercial-Tribune, is visiting Cincinnati, his old home.—The Fourth Estate.

Our m. e. spends practically all his time in New York, where The New York Tribune is published.

There is a lot of sentimentousness and misser-size moralizing in the papers this morning; there was on January 1, 1914, and there will be on January 1, 1915. We shall not increase the amount of it, except by a paragraph or two.

Your happiness this year is likely to be qualified, isn't it?

Oh, well, be as happy as you can.

F. P. A.

HOPE.



JOHN BURROUGHS ON KULTUR THE PEOPLE'S COLUMN

An Open Forum for Public Debate.

His Reply to Professor Wien, with Some Comment by a Reader on German Appeals to America.

(The following letter from John Burroughs to Professor Wilhelm Wien, of the University of Würzburg, is in reply to the letter by Professor Wien which appeared in the Tribune last Tuesday.)

Professor W. Wien, Würzburg, Germany.

My Dear Sir: I have received your letter of November 26. I did not send you the newspaper to which you refer, and I did not authorize any one else to send it. I beg to say that I never heard your name before. I sent my Tribune letter to but one person, and that was an old friend in this country.

I know how you educated Germans feel about this war, and the last thing I should think of doing would be to try to change your minds. If I had been born in Germany and brought up to reverse the state and the army as an outsider can. We flatter ourselves that we see this terrible tragedy of the nations as history will see it—from a distance and without prejudice. We see the whole field, while you can see only a part of it. Naturally my own sympathies would be with your people. I like the Germans. I had much rather have a German for my neighbor than an Englishman; unless I could pick the Englishman I would choose it on the German. My physician in Poughkeepsie is a German, a young man of great skill.

You are masters in all fields—certainly in the art of war. That you have cultivated the art of war so assiduously, and were such masters of it, made you so ready and eager to strike the first blow in this case. One word from your Kaiser to Austria—the word "arbitrate"—and there would have been no war.

You are wide of the mark when you say that in our attitude toward Germany we have taken our cue from Great Britain. We judge for ourselves. We see what Germany did, and the spirit that animates her—the war spirit in its most rabid form—and that is enough.

German Kultur is a fine thing, but you are not going to be allowed to plough and harrow the world to plant German Kultur in it. I doubt very much if you are even allowed to plant it in little Belgium, though your army has certainly ploughed under all other culture there.

We revere England as the mother of nations; we admire the Germany of to-day for her science and her efficiency; we love France—well, just because she is France. Toward the Colossus in the North our feeling is a mingled one of pity, hope and dread.

But I must not weary you, nor irritate you. Not a heart in America but feels for the German people spilling their blood in such torrents, and all so needlessly. With great respect, I am, sincerely yours,

JOHN BURROUGHS.

West Park, N. Y., Dec. 21, 1914.

IN REPLY TO PROFESSOR WIEN

The Prevailing American View of Germany Is Upheld and Fortified.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It is the object of such German propaganda as Professor Wien to antagonize American opinion deliberately. If not why do they reiterate the contemptuous statement that Americans are either incapable or not in a position to form an independent judgment on the present war? If this statement is not meant as an insult it is a singular evidence of German thickheadedness

in that they do not know when they give just cause for offence. If our own political and historical knowledge is not sufficient to form a basis for such judgment we have been open to receive such knowledge from all our self-constituted German mentors ever since the beginning of the war. But it is indeed futile for Professor Wien to explain the German view of the origin of the war. That view has already been found either false or absurd by a tribunal of public opinion as impartial as it is possible for anything human to be. The Tribune's editorial page has riddled it time and again, and it is perhaps a hopeful sign that at least one German professor has perceived his own error.

If Professor Wien desires John Burroughs to retract all he has said concerning the good qualities of the Germans it will probably need no more urging than a continuance of the present obliquity of German moral perceptions. Other nations with equally admirable qualities have before now found themselves placed in a false and despicable position through having ignorantly followed false gods and have saved themselves at the eleventh hour because one righteous man was found among them to raise his voice in protest. But if the German nation solemnly and publicly and repeatedly declares itself to be as one man anxious to share the infamy of broken faith, pillage, rapine and murder, for which their present government is responsible in Belgium, why should we trust an existing threat? Professor Wien names Bismarck as "indeed the national hero"—Bismarck, self-confessed forger and plotter for the crime of war—and quotes him as one desiring peace, saying, "We will never surrender eighteen years after he had deliberately sought and obtained a war, perjury himself and washing his hands like Pilate publicly—because only himself knew how deep they were stained in blood. A man without honor is a fit hero for a nation without honor. So be it."

As for the threat of a diminished sympathy from Germany, one can only say that since sympathy requires some harmony of thought between the parties to it the United States would be lost to all her own ideals were she to put herself in a position to gain sympathy from Germany at present. But perhaps the German would offer us the kind of sympathy the Kaiser has for Belgium; his heart would bleed for us if he could see us in the same position as that unhappy country. That kind of sympathy, also we can very well dispense with.

His one question, whether it is "correct" for the people of a neutral country, like the United States, to take sides in such a passionate manner, is answered by the statement that the neutrality is not supposed to turn a man's blood to butter, and the man who does not feel passionately on the subject of Germany's brutal and wanton attack on Belgium must have a heart of stone.

It is that act which inflames the hearts of men who have no direct part in the quarrel, and no amount of "explanation" can blot it out. Reasoner doubtless has a reason for his act. Justification there is none, and to ask us to preserve a "correct" attitude on this question is merely grotesque, though hardly less so than the face of it, to "make the English news responsible for the unfriendly behavior of Americans." It is not time the Germans showed some of their vaunted intelligence and ceased burying their heads in the sand?

New York, Dec. 31, 1914. M. B.

THE CONTRABAND DISPUTE

An Admirer of President Wilson Criticizes His Action.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: As the son of one of your original subscribers, I am availing myself of the People's Column to express strong disapproval of the action of the administration in the matter of the alleged improper interference by Great Britain with American commerce. My feeling is the greater inasmuch as I am an admirer of President Wilson and was one of his supporters at the last election.

American shippers complain that their business is hampered, but what are the interests of a few shippers compared with the peace of the nation? Great Britain is a friendly power, and has made and will make due reimbursement. War is certain to interfere with the delicate adjustment of business. We must expect disarrangement, and be thankful, indeed, if we are not drawn into the vortex of conflict. And if, as seems probable, the British authorities bring to light sharp practices on the part of certain American shippers, I for one say let the shippers suffer.

WILLIAM T. 'TILE.
Easton, Penn., Dec. 30, 1914.

"CURES" FOR CONSUMPTION

The National Tuberculosis Association Backs The Tribune's Campaign.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The enclosed communication comes from an important association, which has ramifications all over the country, and it seems to me to be well worth space in your columns.

S. S. GOLDWATER, Commissioner.
Department of Health, New York, Dec. 29, 1914.

Dr. S. S. Goldwater, Commissioner of Health, Municipal Building, New York City.

My Dear Dr. Goldwater: The National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis is greatly interested in the suppression of so-called "cures" for consumption, and has viewed with considerable interest the recent campaign along this line carried on by one of the metropolitan newspapers.

We understand that the Department of Health has under consideration the adoption of certain regulations relative to the control or suppression of this evil, and we would like to take this opportunity to urge upon you the adoption of such measures.

We would consider any regulations that would look toward the prohibition of advertising which makes explicit promises concerning treatment a cure of disease, or toward the publication of actual formulae upon the wrappers and labels of patent medicines, as well within the range of powers of the Department of Health, and would urge that you give such legislation your careful consideration.

If the office of the National Association can be of service to you in this matter please do not hesitate to call upon us.

CHARLES J. HATFIELD,
Executive Secretary, the National Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis.
New York, Dec. 23, 1914.

The L. P. B. M. I. T. W.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Friend Seward's letter of the 28th instant discloses an attitude of mind well calculated to disturb, if not entirely destroy, that happiness there may be in store for him on the first day of the New Year, and mayhap for many a day thereafter. I am offering, therefore, to relieve the tension upon

his brain cells and nerve tissue by interpreting the handwriting on the sign, to wit, L. P. B. M. I. T. W., meaning, in so many words, Largest Paper Box Manufacturer in The World. No, I am not the advertising manager for B. G. Hughes, Boxers, America, but I admire him.

J. ALVA JENKINS.
New York, Dec. 31, 1914.

PRAISE FOR JUDGE DELEHANTY

A Lawyer Criticizes The Tribune's Lack of Enthusiasm.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: When I read the heading on your editorial page of this day, "A Good Judge and One Not So Good," I am sure you at the motives which prompted both appointments, but it is surely evident to an ordinary person that Mr. Shearn has been able finally to get some Governor to recognize Mr. Shearn's long service as attorney for

Hearst.

What constitutes a good judge will always be a mooted question. In my opinion Judge Delehanty has been an excellent judge. You admit in your editorial that he has served on the bench of the City Court with credit, but because he has, as you say, not distinguished himself, you do not consider his appointment desirable.

To begin with, he is uniformly courteous, something which so many of our judges entirely lack.

In the conduct of his court he has at all times been able to preserve dignity and decorum, due entirely to his personality and method of conducting the business of the court.

So far as concerns ability, he has at all times shown ample ability to conduct the trial of a case expeditiously, fairly and in accordance with legal principles. His decisions, where opinions are required, show learning and carefulness.

LAWYER.
New York, Dec. 31, 1914.

Wishes for the New Year.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: May the New Year be full of true happiness for you and for the men who help to make your news for the task, for you will win. And, winning peace for the world, you will make this really a Happy New Year for humanity.

NATHAN STRAUS.
New York, Jan. 1, 1915.